

IA # 26-07

FINAL SUMMARY REPORT

I – EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On March 17, 2026, Commander Brian Cousineau (IAB) received information via email, reference an allegation of “police brutality” in which the complainant also spoke at the Safety and Security Meeting on Wednesday, March 11, 2026, alleging “... homeless guy getting pepper sprayed, arrested & then released.” The complainant, Francisco Soto (SOTO), also provided a link to a YouTube page containing what appeared to be cell phone footage of the incident.

IAB viewed the YouTube content, all body-worn camera (BWC) footage of this incident, surveillance video, and reviewed reports written (report # 2026001441) as a part of this investigation. IAB also spoke with SOTO to gather additional information related to this investigation. The interview with SOTO was captured on BWC which was tagged with an IAB number.

The factual evidence shows that on March 5, 2026, at about 8:52pm, Officer Maurice Hawkins (HAWKINS), responded on a report of an assault to Denver Union Station (DUS). IAB noted, HAWKINS documented in his narrative March 5, 2025, however the actual date of the incident is in fact March 5, 2026.

When HAWKINS arrived on-scene, unknown security guards reported there was a male individual with pepper spray and this male pepper sprayed a security guard. HAWKINS contacted the reported male, later identified as [REDACTED] and when asked if he has pepper spray, [REDACTED] did not respond, as he was yelling and stated he [REDACTED] was pepper sprayed and wanted water.

HAWKINS asked [REDACTED] if he needed medical attention, which was declined. [REDACTED] attempted to leave and HAWKINS advised him he was being detained. [REDACTED] continued to attempt to leave and HAWKINS detained [REDACTED] by placing handcuffs on him and having him sit on the ground. HAWKINS was assisted by Allied Security Officers, Sergeant Justin Smith (SMITH) and Officer Guydono Yandura (YANDURA) when handcuffing [REDACTED]. IAB noted, no use of force was used when detaining [REDACTED] or having him sit on the ground.

HAWKINS was able to investigate the incident, and it was learned that [REDACTED] and another unknown male were involved in a verbal argument. This argument reportedly escalated into a physical altercation in which the unknown male pepper sprayed [REDACTED]. The unknown male then fled the scene and has not been identified.

A security officer, later identified as Azarilia Jones-Riley (JONES-RILEY) stated there was a verbal argument between two individuals, [REDACTED] and an unknown male, when the unknown male pepper

sprayed [REDACTED] JONES-RILEY stated the unknown male fled the scene on a bicycle and after the pepper spray was deployed, she walked through the "cloud" and became contaminated by the pepper spray. EMS responded and treated JONES-RILEY for the pepper spray contamination.

[REDACTED] was asked if he wanted to press charges and he declined. [REDACTED] continued to deny EMS assistance and after HAWKINS determined the facts of the case through his investigation, [REDACTED] was allowed to leave the scene with no charges and no suspension issued.

It should be noted that as of this report, [REDACTED] has not contacted IAB to file a complaint of misconduct. IAB is also not aware of [REDACTED] filing any complaint of misconduct related to this incident to any other entity.

As a part of this investigation, IAB reviewed the following policies:

Policy 300, Use of Force, 300.3 Officers shall use only that amount of force that reasonably appears necessary given the facts and circumstances perceived by the officer at the time of the event to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement purpose.

Policy 400, Patrol Function, 400.1.1 Function, d. Investigation of both criminal and non-criminal acts.

Policy 417, Contacts and Temporary Detentions, 417.3 Field Interviews, based on observance of suspicious circumstances or upon information from investigation, an officer may initiate the stop of a person, and conduct an FI, when there is articulable, reasonable suspicion to do so. A person, however, shall not be detained longer than is reasonably necessary to resolve the officer's suspicion.

II – ALLEGATION

It is alleged on March 5, 2026, HAWKINS contacted [REDACTED], pepper sprayed him, handcuffed him, and released him from custody only after HAWKINS observed SOTO recording him with his cell phone.

- a. **Policy 300, Use of Force**, although [REDACTED] has not alleged the officer's use of force was inappropriate, SOTO initiated this IAB investigation and when IAB investigated the use of force, IAB found the allegation is **Unfounded** and **Exonerated** as a violation of **RTDPD 300 – Use of Force – 300.3**
 - aa. **UNFOUNDED** – During the course of the investigation, the allegation that HAWKINS pepper sprayed [REDACTED] is factually not true. In fact, it has been proven by surveillance video evidence, witness statements, and a review of BWC, that an unknown male is the one who pepper sprayed [REDACTED], not HAWKINS. Also, the complainant of this case, SOTO, when interviewed, admitted HAWKINS did not pepper spray [REDACTED].

- bb. **EXONERATED** - Officers shall use only that amount of force that reasonably appears necessary given the facts and circumstances perceived by the officer at the time of the event to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement purpose. HAWKINS used force that was reasonably necessary to detain [REDACTED]. Although it can be argued that no physical force was used in the detention of [REDACTED] which would cause a use of force review, HAWKINS did grab (using soft empty hand control) [REDACTED] right arm to stop his movement and after placing handcuffs on him, sat him (guiding [REDACTED]) on the ground, thus detaining him. Based on the factual evidence in this case and what HAWKINS knew at the time, [REDACTED] was legally detained, and this was well within existing policy and procedures.
- b. **Policy 400, Patrol Function, 400.1.1 Function, d.** Investigation of both criminal and non-criminal acts.
- aa. **EXONERATED** – HAWKINS was dispatched to an assault in progress and once on-scene was advised there was a male individual with pepper spray, and this male also pepper sprayed a security guard. When HAWKINS contacted one of the males involved, [REDACTED], the BWC shows he was animated, argumentative, and was attempting to leave the scene. To conduct a proper investigation, HAWKINS detained [REDACTED] and once the investigation was completed, [REDACTED] was released and allowed to leave the scene. Based on the factual evidence in this case, HAWKINS acted within existing policies and procedures to conduct a criminal investigation.
- c. **Policy 417, Contacts and Temporary Detentions, 417.3 Field Interviews**, based on observance of suspicious circumstances or upon information from investigation, an officer may initiate the stop of a person, and conduct an FI, when there is articulable, reasonable suspicion to do so. A person, however, shall not be detained longer than is reasonably necessary to resolve the officer's suspicion.
- aa. **EXONERATED** – HAWKINS did in fact detain [REDACTED] to conduct the assault investigation. Once HAWKINS was able to ascertain the facts of his investigation, [REDACTED] was removed from handcuffs and allowed to leave the scene. In total, [REDACTED] was detained for about five (5) minutes, which IAB concludes is no longer than reasonably necessary to resolve the investigation.

III – SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

a. *Incident on March 5, 2026*

IAB conducted a review of all available BWC, surveillance cameras, cell phone video, interview with SOTO (April 10, 2026), and written reports in this case. The following is a synopsis of the reviewed footage and written reports.

b. Cell phone video submitted by SOTO ([RTD Police Arrest Man Then Release Him – Victim of Assault Denver Colorado @Regional Transportation District](#))

The video recording starts just as HAWKINS is handcuffing [REDACTED] and he ([REDACTED]) is beginning to sit down. Although a male's voice, reportedly SOTO, narrates his perspective, there is no information offered by SOTO as to what led to the detention of [REDACTED]. SOTO is standing across the tracks on the other side of the platform when the incident is being recorded.

Throughout the cell phone video, [REDACTED] can be heard yelling at the officers, yelling obscenities and generally being verbally hostile and uncooperative.

At about 2:53 of the cell phone video, SOTO is heard saying "They pepper sprayed him, he said. He said they pepper sprayed him." It is unknown if SOTO was talking to another individual or if he was just narrating.

At about 5:15 of the cell phone video you can see HAWKINS take the handcuffs off [REDACTED] at which point [REDACTED] provided what appeared to be identification to Officer Nate Larkin (LARKIN) who had arrived on scene after [REDACTED] was detained.

At about 5:30 of the cell phone video, SOTO is heard saying "So, he didn't do anything, apparently. They're letting him go right now. They pepper sprayed him. I think the guy got beat up by somebody, and then."

At about 5:57 of the cell phone video, [REDACTED] begins to walk away from the officers.

At about 6:17 of the cell phone video, [REDACTED] returns to where the officers are and asks the officers for assistance in locating his glasses, which the officers help.

A train pulls in front of SOTO and the cell phone video ends at the 7:28 mark.

IAB noted no concerns arose after viewing the cell phone video provided by SOTO.

c. RTD surveillance camera review

At about 1:40 of the video, what appears to be the unknown male stops behind a pillar, mostly blocking the view of this male.

At about 1:59 of the video you see [REDACTED] come into view. It would appear he exits the train and initially he appears to be by himself.

It is difficult to see due to the pillar blocking most of the view, but at about 3:00 of the video it appears [REDACTED] and the unknown male get involved in some type of interaction, be it verbal or physical.

At about 4:41 of the video, [REDACTED] walks away from the unknown male and stands closer to the tracks.

At about 4:50 of the video the unknown male comes out from behind the pillar and some type of verbal altercation appears to take place with [REDACTED], with both males gesturing at one another.

At about 5:07 of the video, you can see the unknown male raise his right arm and point towards [REDACTED]. Based on the reaction of [REDACTED], this is more likely than not, when [REDACTED] was pepper sprayed. It should be noted, at no time, were RTD Police on-scene and based on the factual surveillance video evidence, the unknown male, not RTD Police, sprayed [REDACTED] with the pepper spray.

At about 5:21 of the video, JONES-RILEY (Allied Security Officer) can be seen walking towards the scene of the pepper spray.

At about 5:45 of the video, as JONES-RILEY is approaching [REDACTED], the unknown male leaves the scene on a bicycle.

At about 6:12 of the video, JONES-RILEY is seen walking away from [REDACTED] and out of camera view.

At about 6:47 of the video, [REDACTED] can be seen jumping down to the track area and he appears to be dosing himself with water to mitigate the effects of the pepper spray.

At about 9:11 of the video, HAWKINS can be seen walking towards [REDACTED] as he is climbing up a fixed ladder from the track area.

From about 14:41-15:08 a train pulls in and blocks the view of the incident. When the train departs at about 15:08, HAWKINS is handcuffing [REDACTED] and detaining him, with the assistance of Allied security officers, SMITH and YANDURA.

At about 17:32 of the video, you can see a male, reportedly SOTO filming the scene with his cell phone.

At about 20:36 of the video, [REDACTED] is released from the handcuffs by HAWKINS and is allowed to leave shortly after providing his information to LARKIN.

At about 22:05 of the video, [REDACTED] returns with the assistance of the officers to reportedly look for his eyeglasses.

At about 22:30 of the video, as officers were assisting [REDACTED], a train arrives, blocking the view of the camera and the video ends at 24:10.

IAB noted no concerns arose after viewing the RTD surveillance video.

d. BWC review from HAWKINS

IAB notes that HAWKINS has two separate BWC of this incident. It would appear as HAWKINS was handcuffing [REDACTED] his BWC was inadvertently turned off. It would appear HAWKINS recognizes this and activates his BWC a second time. Based on the time stamps of the two BWC videos, approximately 2 minutes and 22-seconds elapsed when the original BWC was inadvertently turned off and the second BWC began.

Because of the built in "look back" feature of the BWC, only 22-seconds of actual video footage was lost. IAB, upon complete review, did not find any concerns with these two separate activations. These two BWC activations attributed to HAWKINS will be viewed as BWC activation at 8:53pm and BWC activation at 9:03pm.

aa. BWC activation at 8:53pm

At about 2:00 of the video, HAWKINS asks a group of Allied officers what happened and they direct him further down the platform. It is slightly inaudible, but it appears as if one of the security officers mentions they are fighting, to which HAWKINS responds "Still?" and begins to run in the direction provide by the security officers.

At about 2:22 of the video, HAWKINS airs over the radio about one of the security officers being pepper sprayed.

At about 3:05 of the video, HAWKINS comes across another group of Allied security officers and asks, "Where are they?" One of the security officers responds he is down on the tracks and advises HAWKINS he is not sure what he has but "He has already sprayed one." The security officer points out [REDACTED] to HAWKINS and when HAWKINS asked who he ([REDACTED]) was fighting, the security officer advises the other male took off on a bike.

At about 3:24 of the video, HAWKINS clearly identifies himself as "Police" to [REDACTED], as he [REDACTED] was climbing up off the tracks. [REDACTED] immediately responds with "Shut your ass up."

At about 3:31 of the video, HAWKINS asks [REDACTED] if he has pepper spray and [REDACTED] responds with yes. IAB recognizes that [REDACTED] probably thought he was being asked if he had been peppered sprayed when he responded.

[REDACTED] begins to scream at HAWKINS, asking him (HAWKINS) "Are you fucking retarded?" again, more likely than not due to the misunderstanding of the question asked.

Throughout the contact, HAWKINS is attempting to deescalate [REDACTED], however he is yelling, argumentative, and at one point referred to HAWKINS as a "Nigga."

At about 7:26 of the video, HAWKINS asks a couple of the Allied officers if anyone is a witness to the altercation. One of the officers responds yes and points to a security officer on the other side of the platform, which HAWKINS asks for her to come around.

At about 8:14 of the video [REDACTED] mentions he is leaving and HAWKINS tells him he must stay. [REDACTED] says he is not detained, to which HAWKINS responds he is detained and to stay here until he can figure out reportedly what is going on.

At about 9:08 HAWKINS again tells [REDACTED] he is staying there and [REDACTED] responds "No." At this point [REDACTED] starts to walk away, and HAWKINS grabs his right arm and begins to place handcuffs on him, with the assistance of SMITH and YANDURA. When HAWKINS grabbed [REDACTED] right arm and handcuffed him, he used a soft empty hand technique, which is the minimal amount of force needed to handcuff an individual. SMITH and YANDURA also utilized soft empty hand technique to assist HAWKINS. At this point the BWC appears to have been inadvertently deactivated. The time stamp on the BWC video is 21:00:56.

bb. BWC activation at 9:03pm

After HAWKINS reactivates his BWC, the time stamp on the BWC shows 21:01:18, a 22-second video segment missing between the two BWC videos.

At about 00:04 of the video, the second handcuff is placed on [REDACTED], and he sits down against a wall on the platform. HAWKINS still has hold of [REDACTED] left arm and it appears [REDACTED] starts to sit down when instructed, with HAWKINS guiding his movement into the seated position against the wall.

It should be noted that there is no audio for the first 2 minutes of the BWC video.

At about 1:58 of the video, you can see HAWKINS activated his BWC and partially hear him say something about his camera being off. During this time, HAWKINS is speaking with an ALLIED security officer who relays that [REDACTED] was trying to leave and the unknown male pepper sprayed [REDACTED].

At about 2:40 of the video, HAWKINS relays to LARKIN that he is going to take the handcuffs off [REDACTED] based on his investigation showing the unknown male as the person who sprayed the pepper spray.

At about 4:25 of the video, HAWKINS asks [REDACTED] if he would like EMS or to press charges and [REDACTED] responds by saying no.

At about 4:35 of the video, Hawkins begins to remove the handcuffs and after getting identifying information from [REDACTED], he is allowed to leave the scene.

At about 6:18 of the video, [REDACTED] returns and asks HAWKINS and other officers if they could help him look for his eyeglasses. HAWKINS responds with asking [REDACTED] if he dropped them on the track and helps look for the glasses.

At about 7:08 of the video, [REDACTED] informs the officers that he found his glasses in his pocket, tells HAWKINS he appreciates him and leaves the scene.

IAB noted no concerns arose after viewing both BWC videos from HAWKINS.

e. BWC review from LARKIN

IAB notes that LARKIN has two separate BWC videos related to this incident. The first BWC is what IAB will focus on. The second BWC video will be preserved, however this video is of interactions with Allied security personnel, RTD PD personnel, and EMS personnel. The second BWC video starts at 21:09:31, which is after [REDACTED] had already left the scene.

The first BWC video of LARKIN is what captures the interactions with [REDACTED].

At about 2:08 of the video, LARKIN contacts JONES-RILEY and a second Allied security officer. During this contact, LARKIN was informed that JONES-RILEY was sprayed, reportedly with pepper spray.

At about 4:18 of the video, JONES-RILEY states she walked through the mist of the pepper spray and when asked if she wanted to press charges, she states no, that she did not feel it was intentional. JONES-RILEY later changes her mind and says she would like to press charges.

At about 9:08 of the video, LARKIN contacts HAWKINS who is with [REDACTED]. At this point, [REDACTED] is already handcuffed in a seated position.

At about 11:20 of the video, HAWKINS starts to unhandcuff [REDACTED].

At about 12:00 of the video, [REDACTED] hands his identification to LARKIN, who documents his information.

At about 12:29 of the video, LARKIN returns the identification to [REDACTED], and he is allowed to leave the scene.

At about 13:02 of the video, [REDACTED] returns and asks for assistance in finding his glasses which the officer's assist.

At about 13:56 of the video, [REDACTED] finds his glasses and leaves the scene.

IAB noted no concerns arose after viewing both BWC videos from LARKIN.

f. BWC review from Officer Christopher McMahon (MCMAHON)

MCMAHON arrived on scene at about 9:09pm, and according to his BWC had no direct interaction with [REDACTED]. The BWC associated with MCMAHON will be preserved as part of the IAB investigation.

g. RTDPD report # 2026001441 review.

a. Narrative written by HAWKINS

- i. HAWKINS written narrative of the event is consistent with the BWC review of this incident. The only discrepancies were the date in the narrative report being March 5, 2025, when in fact this incident occurred on March 5, 2026. The only other item to note is HAWKINS refers to [REDACTED] as [REDACTED] and this is the same person, with [REDACTED] being the middle name of [REDACTED].



b. Narrative written by LARKIN

- i. LARKINS written narrative of the event is consistent with the BWC review of this incident.

c. Narrative written by MCMAHON

- i. MCMAHONS written narrative of the event is consistent with the BWC review of this incident.

d. *Phone interview with SOTO – April 10, 2026*

On April 10, 2026, at about 8:33am, IAB received a prearranged phone call from SOTO to discuss this incident. This phone call was captured on BWC.

At about 3:15 of the video, SOTO stated he received the BWC footage and he now knows the officers did not pepper spray [REDACTED].

At about 4:50 of the video, SOTO admitted that he did not see any of the events leading up to the incident, prior to him starting to film, and he assumed the officers pepper sprayed him ([REDACTED]).

At about 5:50 of the video, SOTO could not describe the police brutality of [REDACTED]. SOTO said he felt it was excessive the way they detained [REDACTED], saying they didn't need three guys shoving [REDACTED] against the wall and bending his arms that far back. SOTO said even with the three guys they could have just grabbed his arms and put them behind his back.

At about 6:10 of the video, SOTO admitted that he didn't like the way they (officers) detained him ([REDACTED]).

At about 12:06 of the video, SOTO offers that they (Allied security) provided misinformation to HAWKINS. SOTO presents this as a concern and provides examples of what should have happened.

At about 29:04 of the video, SOTO offers a new allegation against HAWKINS, that he "lied" on his police report. SOTO says on the police report HAWKINS wrote he asked multiple times if he had pepper spray, he ([REDACTED]) didn't provide an answer and was yelling. SOTO went on to say he ([REDACTED]) was sprayed with pepper spray and wanted water. SOTO insinuates that HAWKINS did something wrong which is why he felt he had to lie on his police report.

aa. Allegation reference three guys "shoving" [REDACTED] against the wall and bending his arms "far" back.

- i. IAB reviewed the BWC of HAWKINS based specifically on this allegation. The BWC does not appear to show HAWKINS "shoving" [REDACTED] against the wall, and in the second video, as HAWKINS is handcuffing [REDACTED], his arms clearly are not bent "far" back. It should be noted there is 22-seconds of video evidence missing due to the BWC being inadvertently turned off. Due to this and in an abundance of caution, the cell phone video and platform video will be reviewed to address these specific concerns.
- ii. IAB reviewed the cell phone video provided by SOTO based on this allegation. The cell phone video begins with [REDACTED] already standing against the wall and HAWKINS starting to handcuff him. Based on this video, you do not see how [REDACTED] is placed against the wall. It should be noted, during the phone interview with IAB, SOTO admitted at about 4:50 of the interview that he did not see any of the events leading up to the incident, prior to him starting to film. Based on this admission by SOTO, IAB finds it difficult to give any credibility to SOTO, when he accuses HAWKINS and the two security guards of "shoving" [REDACTED] against the wall. The cell phone video also does not support the accusation from SOTO in reference to HAWKINS and/or the security officers bending his ([REDACTED]) arms far back.
- iii. IAB reviewed the RTD surveillance platform video based specifically on this allegation. At about 14:42 of this video a train pulls in and blocks the view of the incident. At about 15:08, when the train pulls away, [REDACTED] is already standing against the wall and HAWKINS is handcuffing him. This would appear to be about the same time SOTO starts to record this incident on his cell phone. This video also does not support the accusation from SOTO in reference to HAWKINS and/or the security officers bending his ([REDACTED]) arms far back.

bb. Allegation of HAWKINS "lying" on his police report.

- i. SOTO alleges that HAWKINS lied in his police report when he writes, "I asked Mr. [REDACTED] multiple times if he had pepper spray, but he didn't give me an answer and was yelling." SOTO alleges HAWKINS only asked [REDACTED] once if he had pepper spray, not "multiple times" and [REDACTED] did answer. IAB

reviewed the BWC of HAWKINS related to these specific allegations and determined, factually, that HAWKINS written narrative of the events is accurate. HAWKINS asks [REDACTED] at about 3:27 and 3:31 of the video if he had pepper spray, thus satisfying the accuracy of the "multiple times" in the written narrative. Hawkins also asks on four separate occasions during this time where the pepper spray is, which IAB submits, further proves the factual nature of asking multiple times about the pepper spray. As for the assertion by SOTO that HAWKINS lied on his police report by documenting he ([REDACTED]) did provide an answer and was yelling, this also is factually not true. HAWKINS asks [REDACTED] twice if he has pepper spray and four times where the pepper spray is and throughout these questions, [REDACTED] is on BWC yelling and being verbally uncooperative. Factually, this starts from the initial contact at about 3:23 of the BWC video when HAWKINS announces himself in a loud and clear voice as police and [REDACTED] responds with "Shut your ass up." These factually false allegations by SOTO lead directly to his motivation and credibility.

IV – CREDIBILITY REPORT

The credibility of an individual is influenced by several factors, including their honesty, the reliability of their account, and their motivations.

The first factor pertains to the individual's truthfulness, while the second focuses on their ability to accurately perceive and recall the events in question. The third factor considers the individual's involvement in the investigation and any potential consequences that may arise from its outcome. Additionally, it's important to evaluate whether the individual's account is logical, consistent, and plausible.

When looking at the credibility of the involved officers, HAWKINS, LARKIN, and MCMAHON, IAB finds all three officers credible. Their written narrative of the event closely follows that of the BWC of all three individuals and that of the RTD surveillance video and that of the cell phone video provided by SOTO. IAB could not discover any information which would have led to the impeachment of these officers.

When looking at the credibility of [REDACTED], IAB could only rely on the video evidence of this event as he has not come forward to file any type of misconduct allegation(s) against the officers. IAB does find [REDACTED] credible when he relayed to HAWKINS what occurred between him and the unknown male suspect.

When looking at the complainant in this case, SOTO, IAB does not find him credible. This can be influenced by the fact SOTO was not directly involved in the incident and as a witness from some distance, may not have seen or heard all of what occurred.

More concerning with SOTO is the patently false allegation against HAWKINS, alleging he falsified the police report. SOTO obtained copies of the police report and all BWC and RTD surveillance footage of this incident, and with all the information in front of him SOTO still made the assertion of HAWKINS falsifying his police report and ignoring the facts. This causes IAB to consider the motivation of SOTO and as such, SOTO is determined not to be trustworthy and not credible.

Regardless of the influence surrounding the allegations presented by SOTO, his reliability of the account has been factually proven to not be true. When looking at the motivations of SOTO, posting a factually inaccurate video to a YouTube page and publicly commenting on "Police Brutality" on this incident, this further widens the divide of the credibility of SOTO.

V – ANALYSIS

Pursuant to Policy 1003.9.5 each specific act of alleged misconduct must be classified into one of the following dispositions:

Unfounded: The investigation reveals sufficient evidence to believe the complained of act did not occur.

Exonerated: The investigation reveals the complained of act occurred but was legal, proper, and justified.

Not Sustained: The investigation discloses insufficient evidence to believe the complained of act either did or did not occur.

Sustained: The investigation discloses sufficient evidence to conclude the complained of act occurred and was a violation of policy.

A. RTDPD Use of Force – 300 – 300.3 states in part:

Officers shall use only that amount of force that reasonably appears necessary given the facts and circumstances perceived by the officer at the time of the event to accomplish a legitimate law enforcement purpose.

There was no complaint of excessive force; however, there was an allegation that HAWKINS pepper sprayed [REDACTED], handcuffed him, and later released him with no charges.



This was reviewed and accordingly, IAB has determined that HAWKINS acted appropriately and in adherence to the Use of Force policy, consequently, the specific allegation alleging HAWKINS pepper sprayed [REDACTED] is **Unfounded** and HAWKINS is **Exonerated** on placing hands on [REDACTED] and handcuffing him.

B. RTDPD Patrol Function – 400 – 400.1.1 d. states in part:

Officers will generally patrol in clearly marked vehicles. They will patrol assigned jurisdictional areas of Regional Transportation District, identify community needs, provide support and assistance to the community, respond to calls for assistance, act as a deterrent to crime, enforce state and local laws and respond to emergencies 24 hours a day seven days a week.

h. Investigation of both criminal and non-criminal acts.

HAWKINS contacted [REDACTED] after being dispatched to a call for service and conducted his investigation after responding to the scene. HAWKINS attempted to investigate a criminal act and gather information from [REDACTED], but his uncooperative nature, him initially being a suspect in an assault case, and his stated intention of leaving the scene, prior to the investigation being completed, HAWKINS detained [REDACTED] to further the investigation.

Once HAWKINS was able to establish the facts of the case, [REDACTED] was unhandcuffed and released from the scene.

IAB has determined HAWKINS acted appropriately and in adherence to the Patrol Function policy and consequently this allegation is **Exonerated**.

C. RTDPD Contacts and Temporary Detentions – 417 – 417.3 states in part:

Based on observance of suspicious circumstances or upon information from investigation, an officer may initiate the stop of a person, and conduct an FI, when there is articulable, reasonable suspicion to do so. A person, however, shall not be detained longer than is reasonably necessary to resolve the officer's suspicion.

HAWKINS contacted [REDACTED] after being dispatched to a call for service reference an assault and later that a security officer was sprayed with pepper spray. During the initial stages of the investigation HAWKINS determined that a crime had likely occurred and that [REDACTED] was not free to leave.

Due to this fact and the fact [REDACTED] was trying to leave the scene, HAWKINS detained [REDACTED] so he could further his investigation. After HAWKINS was able to determine [REDACTED] was more likely than not a victim in the case, [REDACTED] was released from handcuffs and allowed to leave the scene.

[REDACTED] was placed in handcuffs for a total of about five (5) minutes while HAWKINS continued with his investigation. IAB has concluded the length of time [REDACTED] was placed in handcuffs and detained was reasonable to allow HAWKINS the ability to resolve his suspicions surrounding [REDACTED]



IAB has determined HAWKINS acted appropriately and in adherence to the Contacts and Temporary Detentions policy and consequently this allegation is **Exonerated**.

Approved:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Brian Cousineau", written over a horizontal line.

Brian Cousineau, Commander

A handwritten date "04/14/2026" in black ink, written over a horizontal line.

Date

Open Records Exemptions

Enclosed please find a copy of the response documents for your open records request. The following information is provided to explain the process employed to review and produce the response documents.

Reason	Description	Pages
--------	-------------	-------
